

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI



701 MAIN STREET, ROOM 200

HATTIESBURG, MISSISSIPPI 39401

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

1:4cv159

Daniel G. Abel
2421 Clearview Pkwy
Metairie, LA 70001



7030401039750

NIXIE 708 FEB 1 0002/14/16
RETURN TO SENDER
NOT DELIVERABLE AS ADDRESSED
UNABLE TO FORWARD
BC: 39401347850 *1266-05991-08-42

Orders on Motions

1:14-cv-00159-KS-MTP

Handshoe v. Abel CASE

CLOSED on 01/08/2016

CLOSED,MTP

U.S. District Court

Southern District of Mississippi

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 2/8/2016 at 10:47 AM CST and filed on 2/8/2016

Case Name: Handshoe v. Abel

Case Number: 1:14-cv-00159-KS-MTP

Filer:

WARNING: CASE CLOSED on 01/08/2016

Document Number: 94

Docket Text:

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER denying [84] Motion for Return of Service Fee Paid, Motion for Sanctions. Signed by District Judge Keith Starrett on 2/8/2016 (scp)

1:14-cv-00159-KS-MTP Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Chris Yount ceyount@gmail.com

Douglas Handshoe earning04@gmail.com

1:14-cv-00159-KS-MTP Notice has been delivered by other means to:

Daniel G. Abel
2421 Clearview Pkwy
Metairie, LA 70001

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document description:Main Document

Original filename:n/a

Electronic document Stamp:

[STAMP dcecfStamp_ID=1081288797 [Date=2/8/2016] [FileNumber=4189924-0]
[2f4705227670537da076b450f1d075da3726be6d471a3f4950b1df59bf0a02e0a0d6
a69fa53c24a2ca8d842655a2cd6f533672ad5b004a491e763e9e13fceb72]]

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

DOUGLAS HANDSHOE

PLAINTIFF

V.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:14-CV-159-KS-MTP

**DANIEL G. "DANNY" ABEL and
CHRIS YOUNT**

DEFENDANTS

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Chris Yount's ("Yount") Motion for Sanctions and Return of Service Fee Paid ("Motion for Sanctions") [84]. After considering the submissions of the parties, the record, and the applicable law, the Court finds that the motion is not well taken and should be denied.

I. BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Douglas Handshoe ("Plaintiff") is the publisher and owner of Slabbed New Media, LLC. On February 13, 2014, Plaintiff published a blogpost entitled "Very disturbing child welfare issues raised in 24th JDC case," which included an image obtained from the then-unsealed case *Yount v. Steitle* pending in Louisiana court. The image was allegedly drawn by a minor child. On February 18, 2014, Defendant Chris Yount ("Yount"), through his lawyer Defendant Daniel Abel ("Abel"), obtained a court order in the pending Louisiana case and served it upon Plaintiff's web host in Texas in order for the post to be taken down.

In response, on February 21, 2014, Plaintiff published another post titled "Ready, Willing and unAbel: A Super 8 Motel Legal Department Update." This post contained a hyperlink to the same image as the previous post. On February 28, 2014, Plaintiff received a Digital Millennium

Copyright Act (“DMCA”) takedown notice from his web host, which was issued after Yount and Abel, on behalf of the minor child, represented that the image infringed on the child’s copyright.

On March 20, 2014, Abel filed a defamation suit against Plaintiff on behalf of Yount and on behalf of an unnamed minor child. (*See* Louisiana Petition [27-1].) On July 28, 2014, the Louisiana court dismissed the defamation suit under Louisiana’s anti-SLAPP statute. On September 17, 2014, Abel filed an appeal on Yount’s behalf with the Louisiana Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

On November 6, 2014, Abel was suspended from the practice of law. On January 20, 2015, Yount filed his appellate brief pro se.

Plaintiff filed the current action with the Court on April 10, 2014, against Yount and Abel. All claims in this case have been dismissed as of January 8, 2016. Yount now brings his Motion for Sanctions [84], seeking sanctions against Plaintiff and a return of his service of process fee.

II. DISCUSSION

Yount’s request of his service of process fee has no basis in law other than as an additional sanction against Plaintiff. Therefore, the Court will analyze the entire motion as a request for sanctions under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11.

Rule 11(c) provides for a “safe harbor” provision that requires a party to serve a motion for sanctions on the opposing party twenty-one (21) days before filing it with the Court. Yount’s Motion for Sanctions [84], filed on January 12, 2016, references actions taken by Plaintiff on January 6, 2016, just six days prior to the filing of the motion. It is therefore apparent that Yount could not have possibly served the motion on Plaintiff the twenty-one (21) days before filing it with the Court, as required by Rule 11(c). His Motion for Sanctions [84], then, is procedurally barred and must be **denied**.

III. CONCLUSION

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Yount's Motion for Sanctions [84] is denied.

SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED this the 8th day of February, 2016.

s/ Keith Starrett
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE